

Interagency Committee For Outdoor Recreation

360/902-3000
360/902-3026 (fax)
email: info@iac.wa.gov



Salmon Recovery Funding Board

360/902-2636
360/902-3026 (fax)
email: salmon@iac.wa.gov

STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

1111 Washington Street SE
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

December 24, 2003

To: Issues Task Force

From: Jim Fox

RE: Remaining Fifth Round Issues

The decisions made by the SRFB at the December 4-5 meeting have been incorporated into the document developed by the ITF entitled *Proposed Approach for Project Evaluation, Allocation of Funds, and the Role of the Review Panel and Technical Advisors*. The resulting document, *The Fifth Grant Round: Decisions Made by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board at its December 4-5, 2003 Meeting*, has been posted on the SRFB web site. An email notice was sent to the SRFB distribution list announcing its posting and soliciting feedback on the unresolved issues. The document is too large to be attached here, but you can access it at:

http://www.iac.wa.gov/srfb/5th_rnd_ITF.htm

A number of issues were left unresolved at the SRFB meeting and were referred to the ITF for recommendations at the February 19-20, 2004, SRFB meeting. The issues, and the page number where they are discussed in *The Fifth Grant Round: Decisions Made by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board at its December 4-5, 2003 Meeting* are:

1. Should an additional two percent be allocated in the first funding increment as an incentive for lead entities to join together in developing a strategy, recovery planning, or combining project lists? If so, based on what criteria? (Page 7).

This issue is ready for ITF discussion. No additional staff work will be provided.

2. What criteria should the Review Panel's technical advisors use when reviewing projects to ascertain that they are technically sound? (Attachment II)

The proposed criteria in Attachment II are based on the revised definitions of low benefit and low certainty that are currently being circulated for public review. Based on comments received, the criteria may be revised by staff before the ITF meeting.

3. What should the specific wording and relative weights be for the questions used to evaluate how well a project list addresses the priorities of the lead entity strategy and how specific and focused the strategy is? (Attachment III)

SRFB and WDFW staff conducted a "test drive" of the proposed evaluation method in Attachment III. Staff reviewed and scored four lead entity strategies and project lists from the Fourth Round. Based on the test drive, staff made some changes in the proposed evaluation criteria (attached to this email). This revised version is being circulated for public comment prior to the ITF meeting.

4. How will the Board use the Review Panel's report, public comments, the strategy outlines, project summaries and other information to allocate the second increment of SRFB funding across lead entity project lists? (Page 10)

Page ten of The Fifth Grant Round: Decisions Made by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board at its December 4-5, 2003 Meeting lists the three approaches discussed by the Board. Staff recommends that the ITF pursue the hybrid approach, Approach 3, with 55% of funds allocated according to Approach 1 and the remaining 10% allocated according to Approach 2. Proposed criteria for allocating the 10% are attached to this email.

5. If, as a result of the state budget requirement that \$23.2 million of SRFB funds be spent on restoration projects, there are insufficient funds for high ranked acquisition and assessment projects, how will the Board decide which ones to fund? (Page 11)

A memo listing three approaches is attached to this email.

6. How will the Board award Federal FY05 funds if they become available in time for the Fifth Round? (Page 12)

This issue is ready for ITF discussion. No additional staff work will be provided.

7. Benefits and certainty: adopt new definitions.

The proposed definitions are out for public comment. Staff will be prepared with revisions at the ITF meeting.

Timing

Issues Task Force meeting: January 8-9, 2004

LEAG meeting: February 4, 2004

SRFB meeting: February 19-20, 2004